

Date: Mon, 17 Oct 94 04:30:11 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #493  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 17 Oct 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 493

Today's Topics:

                    Get Over It  
            Packet Pass-Fail? (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 16 Oct 1994 15:38:51 GMT  
From: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)  
Subject: Get Over It

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:  
: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

: >To address your last paragraph, Bill, regarding the need to pass  
: >13wpm... Some people refer to this as "high-speed" testing. I don't  
: >think that anyone who has learned to use Morse as a true means of  
: >communication would say that 13 wpm is "high-speed". Actually, it is  
: >about the bottom of the scale of actual proficiency. The "value" of  
: >Morse at lower speeds is really quite questionable. Thus, if CW has  
: >any value or relevance to gaining access to HF at all, 13 wpm  
: >expectation seems quite reasonable.  
: >  
: >Is it relevant to require CW at all? Obviously, nothing anyone in  
: >either camp can say will do much to convince anyone in the other  
: >camp...you don't have to follow these discussions long to figure that  
: >out. I believe it is relevant simply because it is one of the two  
: >modes most used on HF by the international ham community, and

: >international communication is, to a great degree, what HF operating  
: >is all about. It has many favorable advantages, and while there are  
: >new digital modes which are currently more "efficient", or better  
: >under weak-signal conditions, or faster (as measured in "throughput"),  
: >it remains true that virtually every HF amateur station in the world  
: >has CW capability available \_right now\_. In addition, Morse, while  
: >not a language, \_does\_ facilitate communication among people who do  
: >not share verbal fluency in any common language. As someone will  
: >point out, the same techniques could be (and are) extended to the  
: >other digital modes, but these modes are still not used by even a  
: >large minority of hams world-wide.  
: >  
: >Bottom line...CW is simple, effective, affordable, available, and used  
: >by a majority of the international ham community. HF is an  
: >international venue. For many of us OFs, that's enough reason to  
: >support the continued requirement. I guess you could consider it  
: >"goodwill dues".

: Two full paragraphs, semantic content;

: "I had to so you have too!"

: Dan N8PKV

Dan, I hate requoting long passages (especially my own) but I want to  
give you (and others) another chance to read those "two full  
paragraphs"...and your one line assesement.

If you really, truly, believe that those two paragraphs say "I had to  
so you have to", your ability to understand language is apparently  
severely impaired. Read it again, address my comments, and show me  
and everyone else you can discuss this rationally.

Greg WB0RTK

-----

Date: Sun, 16 Oct 1994 09:54:00 EST  
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)  
Subject: Packet Pass-Fail?

zcap134@ucl.ac.uk (Redvers Llewellyn Davies) writes:

>gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

>

>>Just a little musing: If CW (manual Morse) did not exist...had never  
>>existed...and the two most common modes in international use on HF

>>were SSB and PACKET, do you think there would be an emphasis on packet  
>>on the exams...maybe even a separate pass/fail test?  
>  
>If CW did not exist then voice comms would not exist. Packet would not exist  
>and radio would not exist in its present form. The technology to encode and  
>decode information on a carrier would not exist if the carrier itself had not  
>been invented.

Morse encoding existed before the advent of radio. In the early days of  
radio morse code was used before the advent of CW. CW is an "tag" applied  
by some to mean morse encoding of a continuous wave signal. That the tag  
may be inappropriate is not the fault of those opposed to morse encoding  
testing.

Dan N8PKV

--

"The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword,  
because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force  
superior to any band of regular troops." - Noah Webster

-----

Date: 16 Oct 1994 07:35:20 GMT  
From: mjsilva@ix.netcom.com (michael silva)  
Subject: Packet Pass-Fail?

In <37pd9d\$mfo@chnews.intel.com> Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:

>  
>In article <1994oct15.150625.42814@ucl.ac.uk>,  
>Redvers Llewellyn Davies <zcap134@ucl.ac.uk> wrote:  
>>  
>>If CW did not exist then voice comms would not exist...  
>  
>Hi Red, ... and Morse coding would not exist. A Continuous Wave, by  
>definition (unchanging amplitude and phase), cannot carry any information.  
>Morse coders are really Amplitude Modulating the carrier with a semi-  
>rectangular envelope so one might say that the 38% of HF hams who ever  
>use Morse code are keeping AM alive and well on the HF ham bands. :-)

Does this mean you're using an AM receiver in your CW work, Cecil? That  
could explain why you don't like it so well! Actually, CW is really our  
way of using SSB outside the phone bands, but don't tell anyone...

BTW, the "Continuous Wave" designation was to distinguish it from the  
various forms of RF generation which produced a modulated signal (either  
broadband hash or a more-or-less clean tone) \*during the transmission of  
a single element\*, thus CW was \*never\* meant or defined as an unmodulated

carrier, just as one that was "clean" when keyed on.

Mike, KK6GM

-----  
Date: 17 Oct 1994 05:57:35 GMT  
From: jrbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ)  
Subject: Packet Pass-Fail?

In article <37ql3o\$1bj@ixnews1.ix.netcom.com>,  
Mike Silva, KK6GM <mjsilva@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>BTW, the "Continuous Wave" designation was to distinguish it from the  
>various forms of RF generation which produced a modulated signal (either  
>broadband hash or a more-or-less clean tone) \*during the transmission of  
>a single element\*, thus CW was \*never\* meant or defined as an unmodulated  
>carrier, just as one that was "clean" when keyed on.

Just to pick a nit, the opposite of "Continuous Wave" is  
"Damped Wave", the amplitude of which decreases exponentially  
with time and which typically is generated with a spark  
discharge through a resonant circuit.

Since radio signals have a much longer duration than the decay  
time for an individual damped wave, multiple damped waves  
must be generated. This process produces very sharp amplitude  
and phase variations in the transmitted signal that result in  
a characteristic wide bandwidth. The amplitude variations make  
the signal detectable with an envelope detector.

To retain the use of envelope detectors when using continuous-  
wave transmission, the wave may be amplitude modulated. This  
results in Modulated Continuous Wave (MCW). Because phase  
coherency remains, the signal is still relatively narrow-band.

Jim Bromley, W5GYJ <jrbromley@sedona.intel.com>

-----  
Date: 16 Oct 1994 22:29:04 -0500  
From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)

References<37jkt7\$sng@times.stanford.edu> <37kg8f\$p8l@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,  
<1994Oct16.231935.28945@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

In article <1994Oct16.231935.28945@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,

Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:

>In article <37kg8f\$8l@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

>>I never said it was easy. In fact, it was difficult, and required hard work  
>>and sacrifice on my part to achieve the 20 wpm element. But it can be done.  
>>The reason there are so many Codeless Technicians out there today is a  
>>direct result of the simplicity of the examination. When all one has to do  
>>is memorize the answers to a question pool, there is no challenge.

>

>That begs the question of whether there \*ought\* to be challenge  
>involved in getting government permission to use the airwaves.  
>The government has an interest in maintaining order on the spectrum,  
>but not in posing challenges for their own sake.

We've already been down that road before, Gary.  
It's called Citizen's Band. Would you want the  
same for Amateur Radio? Be honest.

-----

Date: 16 Oct 1994 16:14:22 GMT

From: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)

References<1994Oct13.142836.22507@lpi.liant.com>

<Pine.SUN.3.90.941013211705.10536C-1000000@access1.digex.net>,

<37ks0t\$ebp@news.iastate.edu>

Subject: Re: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

William J Turner (wjturner@iastate.edu) wrote:

: In article <Pine.SUN.3.90.941013211705.10536C-1000000@access1.digex.net> Tony  
Stalls <rstalls@access1.digex.net> writes:

: >

: >The intent was to formulate questions about the issues I've heard  
: >discussed most often and it's for ONLY the five ARRL Roanoke Division  
: >candidates.

: Nice to know someone else has been paying attention. :-)

: For those of you a little short on reading skills, try to understand the  
: following: THE DEBATE IS OVER THE MORSE CODE TESTING, NOT THE CODE  
: ITSELF. I understand that the code has probably been rotting your

^^^^^^ ^^^^^^ ^^^^^^ ^^^^^^ ^^^^^^ ^^^

: brains, but read the above sentence over and over and over until you  
: ^^^^^

: finally understand it. (There will be a quiz later.)

Real nice, Bill. Real snappy comeback. You sure are building a lot  
of respect for your viewpoints with that one! (In case my brain has  
been damaged by Code, and my intent is not clear...that's sarcasm)

Greg WB0RTK

-----  
Date: Sun, 16 Oct 1994 23:28:21 GMT  
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<37dapa\$ksr@sugar.neosoft.com> <37jkt7\$sng@Times.Stanford.EDU>,  
<CxpDpv.17v@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

In article <CxpDpv.17v@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:  
>

>Becoming a ham is not a constitutional right. Yet not being able to  
>grasp the code is no longer a barrier with the no-code license  
>that's now available; you folks have a way into the hobby that those  
>of the previous decades never dreamed of. Count your blessings.

Do more than count your blessings. A lot of people did a lot of  
work to make that no code test license a reality. Now it's your  
turn to finish the job they started of ridding the testing system  
of special preference for the manual 00K Morse mode.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----  
Date: Sun, 16 Oct 1994 23:19:35 GMT  
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<37dapa\$ksr@sugar.neosoft.com> <37jkt7\$sng@times.stanford.edu>,  
<37kg8f\$p8l@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>  
Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

In article <37kg8f\$p8l@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

>I never said it was easy. In fact, it was difficult, and required hard work  
>and sacrifice on my part to achieve the 20 wpm element. But it can be done.  
>The reason there are so many Codeless Technicians out there today is a  
>direct result of the simplicity of the examination. When all one has to do

>is memorize the answers to a question pool, there is no challenge.

That begs the question of whether there \*ought\* to be challenge involved in getting government permission to use the airwaves. The government has an interest in maintaining order on the spectrum, but not in posing challenges for their own sake.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: 17 Oct 1994 04:13:59 GMT  
From: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)

References<37jkt7\$sng@Times.Stanford.EDU> <CxpDpv.17v@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<19940ct16.232821.29043@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

: In article <CxpDpv.17v@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:  
: >

: >Becoming a ham is not a constitutional right. Yet not being able to  
: >grasp the code is no longer a barrier with the no-code license  
: >that's now available; you folks have a way into the hobby that those  
: >of the previous decades never dreamed of. Count your blessings.

: Do more than count your blessings. A lot of people did a lot of  
: work to make that no code test license a reality. Now it's your  
: turn to finish the job they started of ridding the testing system  
: of special preference for the manual OOK Morse mode.

: Gary  
: --

The job "they" started is finished, Gary. The codeless Tech license is not intended to be the beginning of the end of the Morse requirement. Its purpose is singular, and it addresses that purpose...somewhat. It is an alternative way to get entry into ham radio, like the Novice once was...and it helps (somewhat) to populate the higher bands. The only way the code requirement will be eliminated for HF access is by force of numbers...and that may come someday. But that day will signal a fundamental change in ham radio. Good, you say. Sad, I say. Very sad.

Greg WB0RTK

-----  
Date: 17 Oct 1994 13:36:51 +1000  
From: dave@eram.esi.com.au (Dave Horsfall)

References<37fe31\$7j0@newsbf01.news.aol.com> <781977526snx@skyld.grendel.com>,  
<Cxq2KG.9M2@news.hawaii.edu>  
Subject: Re: The code debate....my view

In article <Cxq2KG.9M2@news.hawaii.edu>,  
jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

| 2. The riffraffs use SSB, not CW (no riffraffs on the low ends of the  
| bands).

Tell that to the bozo sending abusive CW on 6m around here...

--  
Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU) | dave@esi.com.au | VK2KFU @ VK2AAB.NSW.AUS.OC | PGP 2.6  
Opinions expressed are mine. | E7 FE 97 88 E5 02 3C AE 9C 8C 54 5B 9A D4 A0 CD

-----  
Date: 16 Oct 1994 15:59:45 GMT  
From: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)

References<37l6o9\$i7c@crcnis1.unl.edu> <19940ct15.150625.42814@ucl.ac.uk>,  
<101694095432Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>  
Subject: Re: Packet Pass-Fail?

Hmmm. An exercise in the creation of tangents. I like it.

Actually, what my question was intended to do was much simpler. If, for instance, packet and ssb were the "traditional" modes, the two modes most used by the international ham community, and CW (sorry...Morse encoded CW), did not exist, do people think that Packet use, protocol, etc. would be emphasized on the test as code is now? Again, just a philosophical musing.

I think you might see a separate packet exam. Then all those non-packet hams could complain. Well, never mind. I guess musing isn't serious enough for this group :-)

Greg WB0RTK



-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #493

\*\*\*\*\*